

REMARKS

Some confusion appears from the §112 rejection of claims 19-30. Looking at claims 19-30 and the previously filed Remarks it is clear that the purpose of the newly added claims is to distill claim 1 into the bare essentials of the invention and to add dependent claims to eventually get the scope of the newly added claims back to where claim 1 started. This was all that was said about the newly added claims.

Looking specifically at claim 19, there is a mandrel recited there and a gripping member on the mandrel. The gripping member supports the tubular string with no recited intervening structure. However, dependent claim 22 recites an intervening structure on the mandrel that supports the tubing string. That structure is the tubular body that is mounted to the mandrel. Since claim 19 recited the gripping member supporting the tubular string and claim 22 modifies claim 19 it is clear that the gripping member on the mandrel interacts with the tubular body and the tubular body, in turn supports the tubular string. This is consistent with the specification where the mandrel 12 supports the gripping member 108 that in turn supports the portion 114 of the tool body that is mounted to the mandrel 12.

The same relation applies to the interplay between claims 26 and 27 on the same issue. There is no reason in the record for the lack of examination of these claims and should any further office actions contain claim rejections, it is respectfully requested that such rejection be made non-final to allow the applicant a fair examination of the newly added claims for the extra claim fee already paid to secure such initial examination.

The originally filed claims are not inconsistent. In claim 1 the tool body is relatively movable with respect to the mandrel and the first connector is stated to be on the tool body. Looking at the drawings the first connector or gripping member comprises the dogs 108 that abut the mandrel 12 and engage the tool body 16. So, the first connector of claim 1 is positioned on the tool body 16 just as the gripping member 108 is also on the mandrel 12 as stated in claim 19. The fact is the claims are worded differently because two different patent attorneys drafted them. They are based on the same underlying disclosure. The difference is that the newly added independent claims better focus on the key features of the invention without inclusion of all the additional elements found in claim 1. The newly added independent claims start with a more fundamental but totally

consistent recitation of the invention with regard to the placement of the fewer elements listed as compared to the narrower claim 1.

Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's Response to arguments with regard to the application of Wightman to claim 1. To make it clear, claims 1 and 12 and the other newly added independent claims recite that the upper end of the mandrel is not rotated at its point of connection for support, such as to the tubular string in claim 1. Wightman precisely rotates the barrel which he defines as his entire mandrel that includes the upper section 11 that is directly connected to the drill pipe that supports it. The independent claims in the case do not require rotation of the upper end of the mandrel and by implication the supporting structure attached to it.

The Examiner's reference to a sentence in Wightman Column 8 Lines 60-65 in rejecting claim 12 is misplaced in that the statement is that torque is not required to set the seal or to release. As indicated in the detailed description, rotation is required for other functions such as shearing pin 23 (Column 6 Lines 51-63), and testing the set of the seal (Column 7 Lines 39-46). The reference in column 8 is a summary of the advantages that does not discuss all the required motions for all the steps in the use of the tool. Without initial upper end drill string rotation to break pin 23 the Wightman tool will not operate.

Allowability indicated for claims 9-11 is noted with thanks. In view of the relatively narrow scope of these claims when compared to the independent claims, applicant elects to simply amend the independent claims to make clear how they differ from Wightman to secure the allowance of all the claims.

Allowance of all the claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Bielinski
Registration No.: 29,282
Cooper Cameron Corporation
P.O. Box 1212
Houston, Texas 77251-1212
Phone: 713 939 2411
Fax: 713 939 2856

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 31 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence along with any referred to as attached or enclosed is being deposited with the US Postal Service as First Class mail, postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Arlington, VA 22313-1450 on the 24th day of October 2005.

Signature: _____



Rita Kompa